

A Note on Energy-Momentum Conservation in Palatini Formulation of L(R) Gravity

Peng Wang^{1*}, Gilberto M. Kremer^{2†}, Daniele S. M. Alves^{2‡} and Xin-He Meng^{1,3§}

1. *Department of Physics, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P.R.China*

2. *Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal do Paraná,
Caixa Postal 19044, 81531-990 Curitiba, Brazil*

3. *Department of Physics, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721*

Abstract

By establishing that Palatini formulation of $L(R)$ gravity is equivalent to $\omega = -3/2$ Brans-Dicke theory, we show that energy-momentum tensor is covariantly conserved in this type of modified gravity theory.

* E-mail: pewang@eyou.com

† E-mail: kremer@fisica.ufpr.br

‡ E-mail: dsma01@fisica.ufpr.br

§ E-mail: xhm@physics.arizona.edu

Nonlinear gravity theory of the $L(R)$ form has received a lot of discussion due to their cosmological implications in early (see, e.g., Ref.[1] for a review) and current Universe [2]. Generally, $L(R)$ gravity has two inequivalent formulations. One is the metric formulation in which the metric tensor is viewed as the only dynamical variable in the gravitational Lagrangian. The other one is the Palatini formulation in which the metric and the connection are viewed as independent dynamical variables.

Recently, Carroll *et al.* [2] have proposed adding a $1/R$ to the Einstein-Hilbert action to explain the cosmic acceleration without dark energy (see Refs.[3, 4, 5, 6] for subsequent discussions). In Ref.[2], the $1/R$ gravity is considered in the metric formulation. However, there are at least two good motivations to consider the Palatini formulation of $1/R$ gravity [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13] rather than the metric formulation. First, for general $L(R)$, the field equation in the metric formulation is fourth-order and this will cause serious instability problem in $1/R$ gravity [4]. In Palatini formulation, such instability problem is avoided [8] (Note, however, that in generalizations of $1/R$ gravity which includes R^2 or $\ln R$ terms as were shown in Refs.[14, 15], such instability is absent even in the metric formulation). Second, Chiba [3] has shown that metric formulation of $1/R$ gravity is inconsistent with current solar system experimental constraint on Brans-Dicke theory. In Palatini formulation, now we believe that it is consistent with solar system experiments [9, 10] (see also discussion at the end of this note). Finally, it is also interesting to note that the concept of minimal curvature in metric formulation of $1/R$ gravity [16] extends straightforwardly to Palatini formulation.

When considering the $L(R)$ gravity, an important question is “whether energy-momentum tensor is covariantly conserved”. In the metric formulation of the $L(R)$ gravity, after some debates [17], it is finally established that energy-momentum tensor is conserved for any form of $L(R)$ and from this follows a “generalized Bianchi Identity” [18].

Recently, in Ref.[11], by expanding the field equation to first order, it is shown that in the Palatini formulation of the $1/R$ gravity [2], the energy-momentum tensor is *not* covariantly conserved. It is then important to ask whether this is just the result of the perturbation expansion or a true feature of the full theory. In this note, by establishing

the equivalence between the Palatini formulation of the $L(R)$ gravity and the $\omega = -3/2$ Brans-Dicke theory, we show that energy-momentum tensor is covariantly conserved in Palatini formulation of $L(R)$ gravity.

When handled in Palatini formulation, one considers the action to be a functional of the metric $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$ and a connection $\hat{\nabla}_\mu$ which is another independent variable besides the metric. The resulting modified gravity action can be written as

$$S[\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}, \hat{\nabla}_\mu] = \frac{1}{2\kappa^2} \int d^4x \sqrt{-\bar{g}} L(\hat{R}) + S_m, \quad (1)$$

where we use the metric signature $\{-, +, +, +\}$, $\kappa^2 = 8\pi G$, $\hat{R}_{\mu\nu}$ is the Ricci tensor of the connection $\hat{\nabla}_\mu$, $\hat{R} = \bar{g}^{\mu\nu} \hat{R}_{\mu\nu}$ and S_m is the matter action.

The field equations follow from varying the action (1) with respect to $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$,

$$L'(\hat{R}) \hat{R}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \bar{g}_{\mu\nu} L(\hat{R}) = \kappa^2 T_{\mu\nu}^m \quad (2)$$

where $T_{\mu\nu}^m \equiv (-2/\sqrt{-\bar{g}}) \delta S_m / \delta \bar{g}^{\mu\nu}$ is the matter energy-momentum tensor. Also, by requiring a stationary action with respect to variations of the connection $\hat{\nabla}_\mu$, the latter turns out to be the Christoffel symbol of the metric $\hat{g}_{\mu\nu} = L'(\hat{R}) \bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$.

In Ref.[9], Flanagan has shown that the above action is conformally equivalent to

$$\tilde{S}[\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}, \Phi] = \int d^4x \sqrt{-\tilde{g}} \left[\frac{\tilde{R}}{2\kappa^2} - V(\Phi) \right], \quad (3)$$

where

$$\bar{g}_{\mu\nu} = \exp(-2\kappa\Phi/\sqrt{6}) \tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}. \quad (4)$$

Defining ϕ by the equation $\Phi = \sqrt{6}/(2\kappa) \ln L'(\phi)$, then $V(\Phi)$ is defined through ϕ by

$$V = \frac{\phi L'(\phi) - L(\phi)}{2\kappa^2 L'(\phi)^2}. \quad (5)$$

Transforming the action (3) back to the Jordan frame by Eq.(4) and make a field redefinition $\psi = \sqrt{6} \exp(\kappa\Phi/\sqrt{6})/\kappa$, we find that action (1) is equivalent to

$$S[\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}, \psi] = \int d^4x \sqrt{-\bar{g}} \left[\frac{\psi^2}{6} \bar{R} + \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\nabla}\psi)^2 - V_\psi(\psi) \right], \quad (6)$$

where $V_\psi = \frac{\kappa^4}{36} \psi^4 V(\frac{\sqrt{6}}{\kappa} \ln(\frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{6}} \psi))$. This is very similar to the Induced gravity model with $\xi = 1/3$ with the exception that the sign of the kinetic term of the field ψ is opposite to the usual case.

Making a further field redefinition $\varphi = \psi^2/6$, the above action can be rewritten exactly as the $\omega = -3/2$ Brans-Dicke theory with a potential $V_\varphi(\varphi)$,

$$S[\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}, \varphi] = \int d^4x \sqrt{-\bar{g}} [\varphi \bar{R} + \frac{3}{2\varphi} (\bar{\nabla}\varphi)^2 - V_\varphi(\varphi)] , \quad (7)$$

where $V_\varphi = V_\psi(\sqrt{6\varphi})$.

As an example, for the $1/R$ gravity [2], $L(\hat{R}) = \hat{R} - \alpha^2/3\hat{R}$, the potential V_φ is given by

$$V_\varphi = \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{3\kappa^2}} (\kappa^2\varphi - 1)^{1/2} . \quad (8)$$

Thus the field equations (2) of $L(R)$ gravity in Jordan frame can be rewritten in the form,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{R}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}\bar{R} = & -\frac{3}{2\varphi^2} [\bar{\nabla}_\mu\varphi\bar{\nabla}_\nu\varphi - \frac{1}{2}\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}\bar{\nabla}_\lambda\varphi\bar{\nabla}^\lambda\varphi] + \frac{1}{\varphi} [\bar{\nabla}_\nu\bar{\nabla}_\mu\varphi - \bar{g}_{\mu\nu}\bar{\nabla}^2\varphi] \\ & + \bar{g}_{\mu\nu}\frac{V(\varphi)}{2\varphi} + \frac{8\pi}{\varphi}T_{\mu\nu}^m , \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

and

$$-2V(\varphi) + \varphi V'(\varphi) = 8\pi T^m . \quad (10)$$

Now, by the well-known result that energy-momentum tensor is covariantly conserved in Brans-Dicke theory (with a potential), or can be checked explicitly using Eqs.(9) and (10) (this would be extremely tedious using Eq.(2), but rather straightforward using the equivalent formulation (9) and (10)), we conclude that energy-momentum tensor is covariantly conserved in Palatini formulation of $L(R)$ gravity, i.e. $\bar{\nabla}^\nu T_{\mu\nu}^m = 0$. From this follows a “generalized Bianchi Identity”:

$$\bar{\nabla}_\mu \left[L'(\hat{R})\hat{R}^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}L(\hat{R})\bar{g}^{\mu\nu} \right] = 0 , \quad (11)$$

where $\hat{R}^{\mu\nu}$ and $\hat{R}$ are the Ricci tensor and Ricci scalar constructed from the connection $\hat{\Gamma}$ which is the Christoffel symbol with respect to the metric $L'(\hat{R})\bar{g}^{\mu\nu}$. This identity holds independently of the form of $L(\hat{R})$.

In the light of this, we wonder if in the expansion performed in Ref.[11] the terms neglected could provide a contribution that would ratify the conservation of the energy-momentum tensor. A more careful analysis reveals that, in fact, the higher order derivatives of $L(\hat{R})$ contribute with terms of order $\kappa T/\alpha$ and therefore must be taken into account.

Let us consider the dust case where $p_m = 0$ and $\rho_m = T$. With the ansatz $\dot{T} = -\beta HT$, where, for the moment, β is kept undetermined, we obtain that the higher order derivative terms yield the contribution:

$$H \frac{\dot{L}'}{L'} \approx \beta \frac{\kappa T}{48} \quad , \quad \frac{\ddot{L}'}{L'} \approx -\beta^2 \frac{\kappa T}{48} . \quad (12)$$

Taking the contributions (12) into account, the energy density and pressure of the modified energy-momentum tensor of the sources (as defined in Ref.[11]) read:

$$\rho = \frac{\alpha}{4\kappa} + (11 - \beta) \frac{\rho_m}{16} , \quad (13)$$

$$p = -\frac{\alpha}{4\kappa} + (\beta + 1)(3 - \beta) \frac{\rho_m}{48} . \quad (14)$$

Now, from $\dot{\rho} + 3H(\rho + p) = 0$, (13) and (14) it follows that $\beta = 3$ and

$$\dot{\rho}_m + 3H\rho_m = 0 , \quad (15)$$

and therefore the energy-momentum conservation is not spoiled.

Thus, by treating the $1/R$ gravity model in a perturbative form we conclude that in the late Universe limit its dynamics reduces to that of Standard GR with $\rho = \rho_m/2 + \alpha/4\kappa$ and $p = -\alpha/4\kappa$, that is, a dust-filled Universe with a cosmological constant $\alpha/4\kappa$, where the coupling of the geometry with matter is reduced by a $1/2$ -factor.

In sum, we established the equivalence between Palatini formulation of $L(R)$ gravity and $\omega = -3/2$ Brans-Dicke theory and using this to show that energy-momentum tensor is covariantly conserved in this type of modified gravity theory. As a final remark, it is interesting to notice that in Ref.[3], after establishing the equivalence between the metric formulation of $1/R$ gravity and $\omega = 0$ Brans-Dicke theory, we can find that metric formulation of $1/R$ gravity is inconsistent with current bound on the Brans-Dicke parameter ω from measurements of the time delay using the Cassini spacecraft: $\omega > 40,000$ [19]. Then whether the same conclusion holds here? The answer is no: the bound on ω cannot be applied to $\omega = -3/2$ Brans-Dicke theory. This can be seen from Eq.(10). The Brans-Dicke field φ in $\omega = -3/2$ Brans-Dicke theory is not a propagating degree of freedom, so $\omega = -3/2$ Brans-Dicke theory is actually not a true scalar-tensor theory and thus bound on scalar-tensor theory cannot

be applied to it. This can also be seen in the fact that the standard computation of the PPN parameters of Brans-Dicke theory breaks down in the case of $\omega = -3/2$ [20]. So solar system experimental bound on PPN parameters cannot be applied to this case. On the other hand, based on the discussion in Refs.[9, 10], we believe that $\omega = -3/2$ Brans-Dicke theory is actually consistent with current solar system experiment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

P.W. would like to thank Sergei D. Odintsov for helpful comment on the manuscript and Clifford M. Will for helpful correspondence on solar system constraint on Brans-Dicke theory. P.W. and X.H.M. would like to thank Liu Zhao for helpful discussion on this topic. X.H.M. would also like to express his thanks to the Physics Department of UoA for its hospitality extended to him. This work is supported partly by an ICSC-World Laboratory Scholarship, a China NSF and Doctoral Foundation of National Education Ministry.

-
- [1] V. F. Mukhanov, H. A. Feldman and R. H. Brandenberger, Phys. Rept. **215** (1992) 203.
 - [2] S. M. Carroll, V. Duvvuri, M. Trodden and M. Turner, astro-ph/0306438; S. Capozziello, S. Carloni and A. Troisi, astro-ph/0303041.
 - [3] T. Chiba, Phys. Lett. B **575** (2003) 1 [astro-ph/0307338].
 - [4] A.D. Dolgov and M. Kawasaki, Phys.Lett. B **573** (2003) 1 [astro-ph/0307285].
 - [5] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Phys. Lett. B **576** (2003) 5 [hep-th/0307071].
 - [6] M. E. Soussa and R. P. Woodard, Gen. Rel. Grav. **36** (2004) 855 [astro-ph/0308114].
 - [7] D. N. Vollick, Phys. Rev. D **68** (2003) 063510 [astro-ph/0306630].
 - [8] X. Meng and P. Wang, Class. Quant. Grav. **20** (2003) 4949 [astro-ph/0307354]; *ibid*, **21** (2004) 951 [astro-ph/0308031].
 - [9] É. É. Flanagan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92** (2004) 071101 [astro-ph/0308111]; *ibid*, Class. Quant. Grav. **21** (2003) 417 [gr-qc/0309015].
 - [10] G. J. Olmo and W. Komp, gr-qc/0403092.
 - [11] G. M. Kremer and D. S. M. Alves, Phys. Rev. D **70** (2004) 023503 [gr-qc/0404082].
 - [12] G. Allemandi, A. Borowiec and M. Francaviglia, hep-th/0403264.

- [13] Y.Ezawa, H.Iwasaki, Y.Ohkuwa, T.Uegaki, N.Yamada and T.Yano, gr-qc/0405054.
- [14] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Phys. Rev. D **68** (2003) 123512 [hep-th/0307288].
- [15] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Gen. Rel. Grav. **36** (2004) 1765 [hep-th/0308176].
- [16] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **19** (2004) 627 [hep-th/0310045].
- [17] C. H. Brans, Class. Quant. Grav. **5** (1988) L197; S. Cotsakis, Phys. Rev. D **47** (1993) 1437.
- [18] G. Magnano and L. M. Sokolowski, Phys. Rev. D **50** (1994) 5039 [gr-qc/9312008].
- [19] B. Bertotti, L. Iess and P. Tortora, Nature **425** (2003) 374.
- [20] C. M. Will, *Theory and Experiment in Gravitational Physics*, 2nd Edition, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993).